

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/616,404

Applicant(s)

CHANG, YONG JIN

Examiner

David C. Comstock

Art Unit

3732

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David C. Comstock.

(3) Steven T. Zuschlag.

(2) Todd E. Manahan.

(4) Grace Tallon.

Date of Interview: 03 October 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 5 and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: n/a.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Claims were amended to add an entirely substantially transparent and clear nail bed portion to overcome the prior art of record.


(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


Todd E. Manahan
Primary Examiner

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required